Norm Schut Interview conducted by George Scott, 1989
Washington State Archives

Photo courtesy of the Washington Federation of State Employees. We would like to thank Bev Hermanson for her assistance with this project.

Norm Schut with Governor Albert D. Rosellini

Mr. Scott: This is the Legislative Oral History project. I'm George Scott, and I'm talking to Norm Schut who has held a variety of important roles in and associated with state government over the last forty years. Norm, very briefly outline for us what those assignments have been, beginning with Governor Langlie's years.

Mr. Schut: Starting in 1940, I became active in the Service Employees International Union, Local 38 in Tacoma. And in due time I was elected as president and became its part-time business agent. This was a union of mostly low-income, unskilled workers in the City of Tacoma. Prior to that, I had been active with Republican precinct activities in Tacoma through mutual acquaintances and through staff of Thor Tollefson, who was then active in things. My contact with Langlie was a little bit in the 1940 campaign, but he wouldn't have remembered me, I'm sure. After that I had contact with him because of the way I became president and part-time business agent of the Service Employee's Union. I ended up being the leader within the union against the communists out of Seattle from Local 6 who were trying to come in and take over the operation.

When Langlie was Governor, I had occasions at several times to talk with him. They contacted me and were concerned about Mervin Cole and Jess Fletcher and Ward Coley and George Bradley and Tom Rabbitt, Pettis and Bill Pennock, and so on. Another guy's name was Ernest Thor Olson. These were all people that were either holding official positions within the Local 6 in Seattle or they were financed—subsidized—by that local. And these people were, as it turned out later through hearings that were held in investigations, were members of the Communist Party and their job in the Pacific Northwest was to infiltrate and take over the labor movement. We were successful in fighting them off and it was largely because there was a good solid labor movement in Tacoma that was very strongly anti-communist. We recognized what the situation was and came to their aid.

Then, in the spring of '43, I went into the military service. As soon as I left, Ernest Thor Olson was moved in from Seattle. The commies did take over the local during that time. I was out of the country much of the time during World War II so I just lost contact.

Then, in the spring of 1946, when I got out, both Art Langlie and Thor Tollefson contacted me and said they were looking for somebody to be director of the Young Republican affairs for the Republican State Central Committee. So I accepted that position.

I only worked on it about five months when Bud Dawley, who was the Republican state chairman, gave me a special assignment to try to organize a campaign for Congress for Thor Tollefson from the Sixth Congressional District. The Sixth Congressional District, at that time, was the strongest Democrat district in the state and was a heavy labor district.

Mr. Scott: This is the Tacoma area?

Mr. Schut: Yes, Tacoma and all of King County except Seattle. It didn't have any of Kitsap County at that time at all. Pierce County, plus all the way up to Carnation, Redmond, Enumclaw, that area…

And so I managed Tollefson's campaign for Congress. One of the issues was that the incumbent was John Coffee. John Coffee had worked hand-and-glove with the communist elements of the labor movement and this had the more conservative elements in the labor movement in Tacoma angry at him. So I was able to make a real connection on behalf of Thor Tollefson there.

When Thor won the election, he approached me about whether I would like to be his administrative assistant or executive assistant or whatever the title is called now, in Washington, D.C. In the meantime, he had met with some people from the labor movement in Tacoma, unbeknown to me, about things in the future. They had strongly recommended that some of my contact be with labor beyond his staff. So he offered me the job and I accepted. From 1946 through 1948 I was with Thor Tollefson.

I was also national vice president of the Young Republican Federation and in that regard I arranged some speaking engagements in regional Young Republican meetings for Art Langlie. Art Langlie kept in touch with me, and particularly had discussions with me about how a Republican could get better ties with organized labor, things of that nature.

When the '48 campaign came up, Tollefson's campaign was in pretty good shape. He had voted right on the major labor issues and he had the support of organized labor. When the filings were closed there were nothing but unknowns on the Democratic side who filed against him. So Langlie approached Tollefson and asked if my services could be made available to him and his campaign to unseat Mon Wallgren. That was done and I spent the vast majority of time in the 1948 campaign working directly with Art Langlie.

I attended all the strategy committee meetings of his campaign. There was Chief William Fitzgerald, Chuck Franklin the banker, Evro Beckett…

Mr. Scott: Beckett had been a head of City Utilities when Langlie was mayor of Seattle.

Mr. Schut: Yes. Over at the Meany Hotel, we always met up in the penthouse where he lived in the Meany Hotel. Dick Everest, who had been involved with him prior to this and a fellow named Dr. Meadowcroft acted as the treasurer. He's the father of Howard Meadowcroft who's with Weyerhaeuser now. He married a woman who had big investments in the lumber industry in Everett; she was on the board of the Weyerhaeuser Timber Company—that's what the connection was. Meadowcroft was the treasurer of the campaign. We developed a strategy as to the campaign.

At about that time we reached a point in the campaign where—the polls weren't as sophisticated then as they are now, but they showed that Langlie was trailing. And they showed particularly that he was trailing in the Puget Sound Basin. He had problems. While I agreed wholeheartedly with him on his anti-communist position, he was an extremist and frequently overstated the case to the point that he scared some people off. It was hard to try to temper him on that.

Mr. Scott: Langlie was generally perceived as a moderate Republican, but in his anti-communist attitudes, he was much more definite?

Mr. Schut: Yes, he felt very strongly. He dealt with them when he was with the City of Seattle. He knew Hugh DeLacey personally. He was a deeply fundamentalist, religious person and abhorred the communists as the anti-Christ. He was sincere about it; he just felt very strongly on that matter. He was very patriotic and felt that they were undermining our national government and our institutions of government. He just saw them as the enemy.

Mr. Scott: What were Governor Langlie's chief sources of funds? Were they strictly corporate or did he have a good broad-base in his fund raising efforts in '48?

Mr. Schut: I wasn't involved in the '48 fund raising. He had a lot of broad-based support in industry. He had some labor support, the more conservative AFL [American Federation of Labor] type labor people. I remember one particular incident with Evro Beckett, Chuck Franklin and those people out there. Their primary job was to raise the money. Chief Fitzgerald would be involved in that, also. They would meet privately and talk about things.

For example, at one time they desperately needed some money. The wine industry was offering money and they had approached Art on it at one point; of course, he wanted nothing to do with it. Then a decision was made that because the need was so great—and he was appraised of this—they would go ahead and get this money, but without his knowledge. He would not be aware of it, there'd be no strings attached to it, and so on.

Mr. Scott: He actually didn't know that they were going to do that?

Mr. Schut: Yes, he knew, but he wanted nothing to do with it.

Mr. Scott: He was not personally involved?

Mr. Schut: Yes, but he also made it clear, "I want nothing to do with it. I want it understood that I have no obligation to anybody in that regard. You have to get the money to pay these bills. Why, that's your job…"

The reason I mention this business of his campaign in '48 is that there was a very key factor there that had to do with when I came up with the proposal for a campaign theme, "Do you want a Dave Beck-dominated governor? A vote for Wallgren is a vote for Dave Beck." This got him turned around as far as Boeing workers were concerned. And the retail clerks, the railroad labor unions, and for obvious reasons, the longshoremen. This got him support for his campaign toward the last, from those elements. And it showed in the voting returns that from the primary to the final there was a real turnaround in that area. It was over this issue.

This gave him contacts with a lot of good people in the labor movement who were anti-Beck, who hadn't been pro-Langlie. They were drawn to Langlie over this central issue because Wallgren was totally dominated by Beck. I don't need to get into the details of that here but I could give you case after case of proof.

Mr. Scott: Your assessment is, then, that some of the very people that Governor Langlie lost in being defeated by Wallgren in 1944, he brought back in 1948 by virtue of tying Wallgren and Beck together?

Mr. Schut: Yes.

Mr. Scott: So, there was strong labor support?

Mr. Schut: For Langlie, yes. Langlie was very clear on the record as being opposed to the Taft-Hartley bill, as had the Republicans in Congress from western Washington. The CIO type people were Democratic, period. But the more conservative AFL people—this was before the merger in 1956—were the ones who came to Langlie, and who were bitter enemies of Dave Beck because of what he had done when he tried to break the Aeromechanics strike and make a backdoor deal with Boeing. He did that with Sears-Roebuck against the retail clerks. I know example after example of where they just hated his guts.

Mr. Scott: What was Governor Langlie's campaign style? How did he go about it and how effective was he as a public speaker?

Mr. Schut: Excellent! He was electrifying; this was his greatest asset. He had tremendous platform presence, a great deal of magnetism and he could go into an almost hostile crowd… Later on, when he was governor, I would go to the State Labor Council conventions with him and on the CDA issues or something there'd be a hostile group. By the time he was through there was not a hostile group. If nothing more, it was at least neutral.

He had excellent campaign presence. He had a lot of energy and he dealt with crowds better than he did one-on-one. Rosellini was just the opposite; he was a great campaigner one-on-one.

Mr. Scott: People have said that Governor Langlie was "removed" personally. Did you find that a characteristic of his personality?

Mr. Schut: I don't know psychologically how to describe it, but you're very perceptive there. He didn't trust the Republican State Central Committee. The Republican Party organization, he kept himself quite aloof from it.

Mr. Scott: Was that his choice or a mutual disaffection?

Mr. Schut: I don't know what the roots of it are. I do know that in 1948 Frank Burns, an insurance executive, was really the choice of the Republican Party people. Outside of the liberal Republicans or moderate Republicans like Bud Dawley, over in eastern Washington, the Washington Water Power people, a woman by the name of Marian Schulte was the state committeewoman. People like that didn't like Langlie. They didn't like Langlie because he came out of a nonpartisan background—that Order of Cincinnati movement in Seattle, in Seattle city government.

Mr. Scott: We should tell our readers that the "New Order of Cincinnati" was a young man's municipal reform group in Seattle in the 1930s where Art Langlie had gotten his start.

Mr. Schut: Yes.

Mr. Scott: You were suggesting he'd been fairly nonpartisan in his appointments in his first administration?

Mr. Schut: I think so. There were times, like when he ran for re-election in '52, I remember a speech in Pasco where he came right out and said, "The one best way to judge me as far as whether I am a governor of all the people is the fact that the Republican State Central Committee hates my guts."

On several occasions he would position himself as the 'good government' type of guy that was disliked by the professional politicians. And would then, on occasion, be running against the 'smoke-filled room' type of people and the party organization type of people. He could get away with it in this state for the simple reason that party organizations didn't amount to a damn, at least in those days. Maybe they are better now, I don't know. But they couldn't really deliver much in the way of political votes and political support.

And there was a conservative/moderate battle going on in the Republican Party too, and some of the party organization people were the conservatives. It had to do with the Eisenhower/Taft issue and Tom Dewey. Langlie was tied with Tom Dewey.

Mr. Scott: Langlie was for Herb Hamblen of Spokane who was Speaker when the Republicans took over in 1947.

Mr. Schut: Yes, Langlie liked him.

Mr. Scott: Langlie liked him very much. Herb ran for Lieutenant Governor in 1952 and came close. He told me that the governor had come to Spokane in 1948 and, in effect, promised some of the individuals you mentioned that he would be more partisan in his appointments—listen to the party—and that was the condition for their support. Does that seem plausible to you?

Mr. Schut: I don't about that particular incident, but I do know that was a big concern expressed and that was part of the reason that in the primary a lot of the party official people were behind Frank Burns. It wouldn't surprise me at all if that incident hadn't occurred, because that was one of the things that a lot of people within the Republican Party were concerned about. Would this governor recognize the fact that he was a Republican governor? Would he help build the Republican Party and help support Republican candidates?

Mr. Scott: Talk a minute, Norm, about the governor as party leader. Did you see evidence of Langlie aggressively seeking out candidates and recruiting people as opposed to straight party activities, much in the way that Governor Evans later did?

Mr. Schut: He would encourage people to run for office whom he felt were moderates or whom he trusted. He was a funny guy in some respects, in that when I say "whom he felt were moderates or whom he trusted," the "trusted" part was a big factor in that man's life, even towards the very last of his third administration. He got almost paranoid, where if you didn't agree with him on a matter, he felt that you too had turned on him—that type of thing. More and more of the people who had been involved with him over the years began to become dis-involved with him. They just found they couldn't work with him or that he cast them off, so to speak.

Mr. Scott: Was this a factor in his disastrous loss in the 1956 United States Senate race against Warren Magnuson? He had competed successfully on three occasions out of four on a state-wide basis.

Mr. Schut: Langlie was over the hill; he had burned a lot of bridges behind him. People that had been key elements in his campaigns and supporters of his had either been cut loose by Langlie himself or had become disenchanted with Langlie. Particularly in that third term as governor, he got more and more and more drawn within himself. He kept talking about taking problems to God and trying to work them out from a standpoint of meditation and prayer and things of that nature. People found it extremely difficult to work with him. And people started leaving his administration.

Mr. Scott: Did he become more arbitrary in the process?

Mr. Schut: He became distrustful of people, he became more reclusive. I'm sure he felt sincerely about this, but he kept talking, more and more, talking about working directly with God, and he was running out of steam.

People stay in office too long and they stay in politics too long.

The other factor was that he was running against Magnuson, and organized labor wasn't about to split over a deal like Magnuson. Magnuson, whatever his faults may have been, had kept damn good relations with people, even the business community. The business community that Langlie thought was going to lend their support in that race against Magnuson wouldn't do it.

They said, "Magnuson has done too much for the state of Washington. He has personally carried the ball for our industry on this case and that case. We'll give you some help, but we're just not going to come out in the open as far as Warren G. Magnuson is concerned." The University of Washington Medical School is a good example of the whole medical profession who felt that way.

Mr. Scott: You mentioned Dick Everest earlier, who had been Governor Langlie's administrative assistant in his first administration.

Mr. Schut: And for awhile in the second.

Mr. Scott: How were those individuals chosen? Do you have any idea of who did the choosing?

Mr. Schut: I would suspect that Evro Beckett would be involved, Dick Everest himself would be involved, Chief Fitzgerald would be involved. There were a handful of people Langlie had worked with in the Order of Cincinnati days, the Seattle city government that he felt comfortable with, that he trusted. And I'm sure as far as any appointments were concerned, like cabinet level appointments, he worked with them.

In the case of his second administration, he got Fred Dixon to head up the Department of Institutions. He got hold of a fellow, name of McGee, in California who had been up here, I believe, as his director of General Administration in his first term. He had very high regard for that man. That man looked around and found Fred Dixon for him. Later Fred Dixon, when the first budget came out by Langlie for Institutions, was so angry over lack of funds for a decent institution program that he quit.

Langlie had certain ties with certain people whom he trusted and felt comfortable with and he relied heavily on them. He didn't rely on party organization recommendations.

Mr. Scott: Who were the other strong individuals that stand out in your mind in the Langlie Administration? Roderick Olzendam, for instance.

Mr. Schut: Was a joke.

Mr. Scott: He was brought in to deal with the Welfare Initiative that was passed in 1948.

Mr. Schut: And then they eased him out; they made a deal with the insurance industry. It was Fred Baker who worked that situation out where they created a job for "Rod Rickles" where it would be an educational thing

to try to cut down on accidents. I don't know who it was that ever convinced Langlie that Roderick Olzendam should be the guy, but somebody got to him. Olzendam was all right to start with and then he became a problem. The man had a tremendous ego and he didn't have much knowledge of state government. He started getting off on screwy things. A decision was made that he had to be eased out, and he was.

Mr. Scott: Ernie Brabrook had been the long term director of Finance and Business for the state. What was the state of his art? It's been asserted that the state, all the way through to the Rosellini years, was pretty much on a hand ledger, rigid accounting approach.

Mr. Schut: Yes, he was known affectionately as "Pen and Quill Ernie." He did an audit like an old-time bank clerk with the eye shade. I didn't know him, of course, in the first administration but in the second administration I did. He was very loyal to Art Langlie.

He knew I was close to Art Langlie so things that I was interested in he was very favorable to, he was very helpful to me. He was kind of an old womanish type of person as far as how he handled things and kept everything very much under control. That type of an operation just wouldn't even get off the ground in this day and age with the complexities of every thing. Things were a lot more simple then than they are working with now. Everybody didn't have all the tools that they are working with now.

Mr. Scott: Governor Rosellini made a strong case in 1957 when he took over that the institutions were pretty much in a shambles. Was this an oversight on the part of both the governor and the Legislature, or was it more a case of Governor Langlie's priorities?

Mr. Schut: The Legislature has to shoulder its share of the blame as far as the deterioration of institutions. The executive branch certainly has to take its part. One of the names that rings a bell with me is the name Sargeant; he was in the Wallgren administration in some key position and then went to Cliff Yelle the state auditor.

Langlie had a very hard-nosed attitude toward institutions that the law said all you had to do was furnish the inmates or juvenile delinquents a straw mattress. It was strictly a custody thing with as little expenditure as possible. Institutions, of course, are expensive things to operate. Langlie was conservative on fiscal matters and didn't want to be the kind of guy coming in with major budget requests.

When I left the Langlie administration, I became the director of the State Employee's Union. That was in December of '52. In January of '53, my first legislative session representing the State Employee's Union, our prime piece of legislation was to establish a forty-hour work week in state institutions.

Now, to give you an example of how both the executive and legislative branches were guilty of the treatment that institutions and institutional employees had received. Those employees in the state of

Washington, a modern labor state, were touted as being the savior of Washington at one time. Those employees were working twelve-hour shifts, two shifts a day, sixty hours a week. Only two places in the country had longer hours and lower wages than the state of Washington, and that was Alabama and Mississippi. I got through to Governor Langlie on that matter. And everyone said, "You know that bill's just not going to go anywhere. It's not going to pass."

I got Langlie to see the justice of it and the need for it. I got a fellow by the name of Tom Montgomery, who was the Republican chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, to be the prime sponsor of the bill. That caught everybody off-guard. The Democrats were embarrassed. Reuben Knoblauch and all of those… they had been in office all this time, and this had been allowed to happen. One of the people who fought the thing to the point where, finally, Governor Langlie called him in and gave him twenty-four hours to get the bill out of the Senate Rules where he had helped bottle it up, was Harold Van Eaton, his own director of General Administration, which at that time also included Institutions.

So there were elements in his own administration that were a problem in that regard. Harold Van Eaton was a General Administration type of guy, and Institutions was the step-child. It was part of that overall deal. When Langlie got Fred Dixon up here, by law, the Department of Institutions was still just a part of General Administration. But he peeled it off and Langlie named him Superintendent of Institutions by an executive order.

It took us nine months to get that forty-hour work week installed in state institutions. This helped considerably, improving the quality of intuitional employees and cutting down in what had been a horrendous turnover. We moved also to get institutional employees off the grounds. Because of those twelve-hour shifts, they were living in dormitories right on the institution's grounds. You got to the point where you couldn't tell the employee from the patient; they were all part of the same setup. Langlie finally began to realize that institutions were a real problem. That's when he got hold of McGee and McGee found Fred Dixon for him.

I can't remember the exact time span, but it seems to me that Fred must have been there about two years. He did a tremendous job. He was very employee oriented. He had a long background in the federal institution system, the federal penitentiaries and so on. He was well respected in the field. We got a lot of things started; we got training programs. I was working from the union standpoint, Dixon from the administration standpoint, and jointly we were getting training programs going for LPNs and other employees.

Then came the problem about the next budget. I guess it would have been the '55 session, when Fred Dixon saw the small amount of money that was being recommended in the budget for institutions and for

continuing some of the things they'd gotten started to meet the needs he had identified; he had a long session with Langlie over it. Langlie would have had to do something in taxes or something, I don't remember what, but he couldn't move Langlie as far as a substantial increase in the budget request for institutions, so he just threw in the sponge.

He said, "There's no way that we can continue to do the things we've started to do and to really do the things that really need to be done without a substantial influx of new monies." And the new monies weren't there.

Mr. Scott: In late '55, early '56, there were riots at both the penitentiary and at the reformatory at Monroe; they may well have proved Governor Langlie's Achilles heel. Governor-to-be Rosellini, who chaired the investigation committee, got a lot of publicity.

Mr. Schut: Yes. We made some substantial progress as far as employees were concerned in those institutions under Langlie, but the funding wasn't there. I was never involved in his tax deals. He had Roger Freeman; they went with that flat two percent corporate tax that, I believe, the Supreme Court threw out. There were some problems there. Langlie was strapped as far as the revenue was concerned, and for whatever reasons, the institutions didn't get the priority they should have gotten to get the job done. He was more an old-fashioned type of guy; treatment and rehabilitation were things he didn't understand in any great depth.

Mr. Scott: Talk a bit about Roger Freeman, who was the governor's tax advisor. What were his assets and liabilities?

Mr. Schut: Well, he had a heavy German accent and a kind of an arrogant attitude; those were negatives. He came in out of the blue. Somebody that was a retail shoe store person, I think, in Seattle recommended Roger Freeman to Art Langlie as a genius that was just the thing he needed.

Roger was resented as an outsider. He was an outsider as far as the Republicans were concerned. He was an outsider as far as the state government people were concerned. He was an outsider as far as Langlie's cabinet was concerned, who were people who had been with Langlie, at least in some regard, over a period of time. His biggest liability was relating to people and trying to sell the things he was promoting. I think it's no question that the man was brilliant.

Mr. Scott: Likewise, Langlie brought in Holland Houston.

Mr. Schut: Same example, perfect. Holland Houston had real problems relating to people. He was kind of an arrogant guy. He had a mind set, and he was private power oriented. We were then, more so than now, a public power oriented state, politically. Later on, it got embarrassing to where there were some accusations made

about it. He had stock invested in the private power industry and it went back to Stone and Webster.

Mr. Scott: Governor Langlie, in his third term between ’53 and ’57, fought for the private power perspective against Senators Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson, who wanted more federal dams and a Columbia Valley Authority.

Mr. Schut: The Hell’s Canyon Dam was a perfect example where Holland Houston convinced Langlie it was not a feasible project. Holland Houston’s interest was in blocking the federal government from doing it. The private power interests were on that side of the issue. I never really knew what all the connections were of Holland Houston.

Langlie used to send him over to see me in the office I used, which is now the Institutions Building, to try to have discussions with him about practical politics, about the ramifications of things politically, about relating to people better personally. But that wasn’t his world. He wanted to be holed up in an office, all by himself, and he wanted to do all these reams of projections and figures and ideas he had. He just didn’t have any power base of his own. But he was tied in with private power, there’s no question about that. He became a problem to Langlie.

Mr. Scott: How did the governor relate to legislators? Did he do a lot of one-on-one? Did he tend to group things?

Mr. Schut: My recollection is that he had certain legislators that were favorites of his, those he trusted that he felt were his type of person.

Mr. Scott: Senator Barney Dahl from eastern Washington?

Mr. Schut: That name rings a bell with me. Senator Tom Hall, Langlie liked him and worked with him quite a bit. There were certain people over in the House, like Herb Hamblen, whom you mentioned.

Mr. Scott: Representative Pat Comfort from Tacoma?

Mr. Schut: Yes and Ernie Huntley, who was then a state senator, and later got appointed to the Tax Commission. Johnny Robertson, who he later appointed to Employment Security—he didn’t work out very well there. I don’t remember all the names.

But Langlie was more a one-on-one type of person and if he took a liking to somebody, like he took a liking to me early on. We had a very close personal relationship. I had far more influence with him than was justified from a standpoint of who I was, what my connections were, how I paid my dues, anything of that nature.

Mr. Scott: You’ve mentioned several people in the administration who did not have good political intuition. Who served that role for the governor apart from yourself?

Mr. Schut: Well, he wasn't in the administration, but one of the guys who always gave Langlie a lot of good practical, political advice was Chief William Fitzgerald of the Seattle Fire Department. He really did seem to have a feel for that sort of a thing. Dick Everest, while he didn't have a background in the hard stuff of politics, was a perceptive person as far as politics was concerned and was good in that respect. Some state senators and legislators that he took a liking to personally, and that he worked with, I think, were advisors. Bud Dawley, who was Republican State Chairman during that period of time, he was able to get in to see Langlie, work with him, and advise him. He got a lot of help from Tom Dewey in the way of advice. He and Tom Dewey were close.

Mr. Scott: What were Governor Langlie's chief accomplishments?

Mr. Schut: There's this saying about "where there's smoke, there's fire." John Kennedy said something once that really impressed me. He said, "Where there's smoke, there may be only a smoke-maker." Whether Wallgren was guilty of corruption in office, of kickbacks and selling liquor licenses and stuff I heard, I was out of the country, I don't know. But there was a general feeling abroad in this state that things weren't as good as they should be as far as government was concerned, that there was dishonesty in politics. Langlie had an excellent reputation for honesty and forthrightness, being a hard worker, being committed, and being sincere. There were stories around about the long, wild, booze-drinking parties in the mansion under Wallgren. About the bagmen.

For example, people associated with my parents—my parents were deeply religious—would make the comment to me, "We were kind of surprised and shocked when we found out you were getting involved in state politics. But when we learned it was with Langlie, we were certainly glad that if you decided to do it, that's the man that you're associated with."

So that's one thing. He cleaned up some messiness in state government as far as ethics were concerned. Another thing he did that was extremely important, at least to me, he established for the first time in this state an honest-to-god labor management relationship as far as a governor and the state employees were concerned, and as far as directors of agencies and state employees.

Mr. Scott: That was largely through yourself or did he have other mechanisms?

Mr. Schut: No, he had some good ties with organized labor before he ever ran into me. Bobby Harlin…

Mr. Scott: Bobby Harlin had been a city councilman in Seattle when the governor was there, and was later his Director of Labor in the first administration.

Mr. Schut: And he was from the United Mine Workers Union, had been very much involved with the United Mine Workers Union. And there were some people like that.

I don't hesitate to say I played a major role as far as Art Langlie's labor relation program was concerned in the state of Washington. When I came back to the Langlie administration from Tollefson, first on leave in 1949, my major assignment was labor relations. My second major assignment was congressional liaison. The congressional delegation wasn't getting along with Art Langlie. Again, it was Art Langlie's aloofness and not being part of a team. We did a number of things, first when I was in the administration and then when I was representing the union, working with him when he was the governor, establishing the rights of employees to belong to unions, establishing grievance procedures, things of that nature. He made a major breakthrough as far as that was concerned.

Mr. Scott: In 1951, Governor Langlie sponsored a corporate income tax that you correctly remember was thrown out by the Supreme Court. What was the background to that attempt?

Mr. Schut: I know it was a program that was developed, the details of it, by Roger Freeman. We needed more revenue. Langlie didn't want to get into a personal income tax, as I recall, and what was settled on was a flat two percent tax on corporation profits. He felt he could afford it, he felt the state needed it, and he was advised legally, from within his administration, that this could, constitutionally, be done. He put the Democrats behind the eight-ball in that the liberal Democrat couldn't quite see himself in the Legislature, on the floor, opposing a flat two percent tax on corporation profits. Many of the things that Langlie wanted done he got through the Legislature with Democratic support. He frequently had less support among the Republicans than he did with the Democrats.

Mr. Scott: In terms of attempting new ways of doing business, for instance, was Langlie's proposed tax change in the progressive Republican mode?

Mr. Schut: I looked upon him as a progressive on labor relations matters—workman's compensation, unemployment comp, the rights of labor, things of that nature. He was progressive.

Mr. Scott: Proposing an income tax as a Republican in the Legislature, a corporate income tax, runs against the traditional grain, too.

Mr. Schut: But he never felt that comfortable with the big corporations, he never did. I don't know whether that went back to the Order of Cincinnati days or what. The people that caused him all the trouble politically were largely the big cats in the Republican Party that were at odds with him time and time again. They had their ties to the corporations. I don't think he felt he was comfortable with all of them or any one of them.

Mr. Scott: Are there other things that characterize the Langlie administration, particularly between 1949 and 1957?

Mr. Schut: One of the other reasons Langlie wanted me to come back from Tollefson, from Washington, D.C., was that one of the groups I had established a good working relationship with was the Townsend Movement. I was doing a lot of work with the Townsend Movement, which was strong in the state at that time. Townsend clubs were all over the place.

Mr. Scott: This is the late forties?

Mr. Schut: Yes, so Langlie created the first State Council on Aging. It was large, much larger one, than anything that exists now, and it wasn't in statute. He began doing a number of things in the way of the old age pensions, things of that nature that were helpful to the elderly. In 1940, one of the campaign issues he used against the previous administration of Governor Clarence D. Martin was that he would fire Ernst who was the director of Social Security, Public Assistance, whatever it was called in those days, over cutbacks in old age pensions. He was very much opposed to Representative William Pennock and the Old Age Pension Union—that was a communist front group that stirred up a lot of trouble.

He did quite a few good things trying to take into consideration the problems of the elderly. He was very much devoted to his mother. She was elderly. She was in need. She lived at the mansion for some time; then she lived at the Edmond Meany Hotel at the graciousness of Evro Beckett.

I remember one time he called a special session of the Legislature, and one of the issues he used—the Democrats were in control of the Legislature—was that he wanted an increase in the old age pension. They hadn't given it to him. You remember, the galleries were loaded with all those old-timers I got the Townsend Clubs to send down.

He had a chip on his shoulder to the extent of the welfare program where it came to help the young people… the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program. But he had a real loyalty and an affinity toward the elderly. I think it had to do with his relationship with his elderly mother and with the problems she had. Apparently his dad had been an alcoholic and there were a lot of problems. He didn't leave her with anything to live on when he died.

There was a religious thing involved, too, about "honor thy father and thy mother." So he was a very strong guy with an old-fashioned work ethic. He saw this welfare program as encouraging people not to work. He had a problem there, but not with the elderly.

Another thing I would say about Art Langlie was that he was a lonely man. He didn't have a circle of friends he could play golf with, go on hunting trips with, or anything of that nature. He had just those few people who stayed at the mansion like Dick Everest and Evro Beckett. They would play pinochle on a Sunday

evening or something like that. He was a lonely type of guy that probably should have been a religious leader.

Mr. Scott: Let's talk for a moment about Governor Mon C. Wallgren, who defeated Arthur Langlie in that 1944 election, and was in office for one term through January of 1949. Do you have impressions about his style?

Mr. Schut: I didn't know the man personally and I need to state that right up-front. My impression is that he was a weak person. The reason I say that is he came totally under the domination of Dave Beck. Dave Beck put a substantial amount of money into his campaign because Dave Beck and Art Langlie had clashed when Art Langlie was the mayor of the city of Seattle and they didn't like each other.

After Wallgren was elected, the next thing that happened was the Highway Department employees—the maintenance crews—were told they had thirty days to pay a fifty-dollar initiation fee into the Teamsters Union and then start paying their monthly dues or they would be terminated. The political ramifications to that kind of thing are obvious. Attempts were made by the Building Service Employee's Union with Rosellini when he came into office on that thing and he just refused it carte blanc.

Wallgren didn't refuse it. Wallgren yielded to the thing and it never got anywhere for the simple reason that the maintenance workers walked off the job. This was during the war and they couldn't get replacements for them. So the thing was kind of dropped. There was a strike up in Bellingham and a number of places in the state over that.

The second incident—and this was told to me by H.S. McIlvaigh, who for years was secretary/treasurer of the Tacoma Central Labor Council—he had an appointment to see Dave Beck in Seattle. He was in his office waiting room to see Dave Beck and there, sitting in the waiting room, was Mon Wallgren.

Mr. Scott: During the time he was an incumbent?

Mr. Schut: Yes, while he was Governor. He was kept waiting for forty-five minutes before Beck was willing to see him. And you know, McIlvaigh said, "It was embarrassing to me. It looked like there was a governor being humiliated." Wallgren was just sitting there taking it. There were other indications of things that gave me an impression, which is, again, a third-party type of a thing, that this guy was weak.

He was a very personable type of an individual from everything I could observe and everything I ever heard about him. He was very friendly one-on-one. The news media people liked him, the politicians liked him. He was great on entertaining, whether it was in the mansion or it was on that yacht, "The Olympus," that the Fisheries Department had and he used quite a bit. He was just the kind of a guy you'd be friendly with in a tavern, or a pool hall, or on the street, or at a lodge meeting, or that sort of a thing. Great contrast, for example, to an Art Langlie or even to a Dan Evans. He was just a very personable type of a guy.

Mr. Scott: What sort of a program did he present?

Mr. Schut: I never was involved very much in that. I know that in the '48 campaign, one of the things Langlie's people used against Wallgren was an attempted policy move on his part. That had to do over the Game Commission and that initiative that Wallgren pushed.

You mentioned earlier to me about reclamation in eastern Washington. For the two years that I was back there in Washington, D.C., while he was still governor, the congressional delegation wasn't working with Mon Wallgren on things like that. They had their own agenda, the Democrats did. In the case of Tollefson, we became interested in what was called the Columbia Basin Account. It was the PUD people over there. It was Kirby Billingsly from the Wenatchee area. Congressman Hal Holmes was involved in it to an extent, and so was Congressman Walt Horan. Walt was very strongly a public power man.

For a governor, I didn't see Wallgren having much impact or effects or contacts or relationships with the federal congressional delegation. We saw more of Pearl Wanamaker, who was back there on federal aid to education and federal moneys for military impacted districts, things of that nature. Now, maybe I didn't see all that, for the simple reason I was with a Republican congressman and Mon Wallgren was a Democrat. But you had Maggie and Jackson there, and they were leaders in their own right. They didn't need a governor telling them what they ought to be doing as far as the state of Washington was concerned.

Mr. Scott: At least one other person has portrayed Wallgren as a rather partisan politician when it came to dealing with the Legislature. Did you read that in his personality otherwise?

Mr. Schut: I can't honestly answer that. I know that he was partisan in his political appointments, there's no question about that. And he was partisan from the standpoint of being a good loyal Democrat with no agenda or program of his own. Whatever the party's program was his program.

Mr. Scott: The state yacht, which was owned by the Fisheries Department, "The Olympus," became quite a controversy in the 1948 election. How much did it hurt the governor?

Mr. Schut: Well, I think it hurt him. What hurt the governor was a series of events and stories about his so-called lavish entertaining where the liquor industry would provide the stuff. I never saw the yacht, but it was purported by the people that had been on it to have heated toilet seats. All kinds of things like that. And this was at a time when people had been under great restrictions as to what material goods were available because of the war, price controls, things of that nature. It was just a general impression that he was an easy-going kind of a guy. That he liked to be comfortable. Maybe not like the "rich and the famous type" of life, but a comfortable life. He liked to play poker, have his drinks, have the yacht, and things of that nature. It didn't portray him as

an aggressive populist leader that had a real agenda for the people of the state of Washington. Outside of that, the Game Commission issue reacted negatively to him. It looked like a power grab and it made the sportsmen mad.

Mr. Scott: Norm, moving to the administration of Governor Albert D. Rosellini, which began in 1957, he had been a state senator and was both a majority and minority leader. How did you see him perform in that role?

Mr. Schut: He was a politician's politician. He was a good legislator. He knew how to work the legislative process. He was very patient with people. He was great at finessing the process, massaging people in it, giving an ounce of blood and taking an ounce of blood. He was very partisan. He would pick up support wherever he could find it. He was a very affable, very friendly guy. He was always seen evenings out at the various watering holes. I never saw him drunk on any occasion at all but I certainly saw him drink quite a bit. But he was very social and easy to talk to, very friendly, very personable, warm.

He was a legislative tactician. He was telling me that he wasn't a good public speaker, that he wasn't particularly all that good in debate. But he knew how to get things done. I would liken him more to a Maggie than I would to a Scoop Jackson. He was a legislative finesser, and knew how to get things done.

Mr. Scott: When you say he wasn't a good public speaker, what kept him from being one?

Mr. Schut: Some people are good public speakers and some aren't. He looked all the time like he was forcing himself when he was speaking. He had a habit of always dropping the "g" on a word that ended in "ing". He just wasn't a good public speaker. Art Langlie was a terrific platform public speaker when he got wound up. He wasn't very good on written speeches and reading them; they would hurt his style. But get him on an issue he was familiar with, he was a good public speaker. He improved over time and kept working at it. He struggled with it. He had a little bit of a stutter once in awhile.

Mr. Scott: How did he handle his role as majority leader? Was he out-front with an agenda or was he a conciliator and a facilitator in his caucus?

Mr. Schut: I think it was a combination of all three, but particularly the last two. He was a facilitator and a coordinator, trying to get a consensus. He had trouble within his caucus.

Mr. Scott: Senator Dave Cowan from Spokane, Jack Rogers…

Mr. Schut: Senator Schroeder from Puyallup, and from the Pasco/Tri-Cities area, Stanton Ganders, people like that.

Mr. Scott: There was an ongoing division in the early fifties in the Democratic caucus in the Senate, you're saying, that really denied him a working majority at points?

Mr. Schut: Yes, but then he would pick up some of the moderate-to-liberal Republicans in some of those issues. Of course, when Langlie was in there, Langlie wasn't getting any more support from those conservative Democrats than he was getting from the conservative Republicans. And so you had odd coalitions all the time. It was a question of Langlie as governor and Rosellini as a floor leader looking for allies, not friends.

Mr. Scott: Toward the end of the Langlie administration in 1956, there were riots in both the state prison in Walla Walla and the state reformatory at Monroe. Then Senator Rosellini became chair of a committee that investigated them. What do you remember?

Mr. Schut: He got a lot of publicity. That's when TV started becoming a factor in state politics and some of those hearings were televised. He also was in a crime investigation deal when he got in Tacoma where there was an alleged underworld. Some of the people he was investigating—working over the coals—when the hearing was official, he was out having a cocktail with after the hearing was over. I think his name was Vito, in Tacoma, I saw that. But a lawyer does that too; a lawyer has his performance in court, and afterwards they're friends.

He milked that to the hilt. He had a good political sense; he saw that as a good way of getting public exposure in a favorable way. He was the investigative person from the Legislature representing the people, and here was something that was wrong and needed to be righted. Mostly, it was a kind of a soap opera type of a thing that people were kind of fascinated by.

Mr. Scott: Were there reforms in the way that the reformatory and the prison were being managed as a result?

Mr. Schut: The biggest problem the prison system had at that time, and it was because they weren't adequately funded for many, many years, was that the cons were running it. The cons had "kangaroo courts", and you had to do a "Walla Walla." I remember very well, the trustees, among the cons—the inmates, 'residents' as they call them now, were staffing the classification division. The classification division is the one that maintains all the records on all the inmates and gets all the material ready for presentation to the parole board and things of that nature. This was all being handled by inmate labor because there wasn't enough staff. They didn't pay enough to get good staff; they didn't train the staff. They didn't have enough staff, period, because of the severe budget restrictions they were under. They were also using inmate labor quite loosely.

A fellow by the name of Brady, who was the assistant superintendent at Monroe, was in cahoots with some of the inmate leaders. They had a brick factory, manufacturing bricks at Monroe and then turning around and selling them in the community to contractors that were using them in the construction industry. The inmates got their share of the deal and Brady and some of the cohorts under him were getting their share of the

rake-off. This was going on in more than just a few places. This was a whole time when the prison system was nothing but a custody deal.

Could I back up and go to the ’52 campaign, because I think there were some interesting things that happened. As you remember, in the ’52 campaign the candidates were Hugh B. Mitchell, Rosellini, Earl Coe, Charles Hodde, and Tom Martin. Rosellini kept coming up. Mitchell was the front runner, Rosellini toward the last. This again was when TV was first beginning to come into the picture. It portrayed Mitchell as a left winger, a dupe of communist front groups. Rosellini portrayed himself as the mainstream, all-American, patriot type of a candidate, a law enforcement, law-and-order type. It got pretty bitter toward the end. Mitchell started slipping in that primary and Rosellini started gaining on him. But he didn’t take it, Mitchell made it.

Now, I was involved in the Langlie campaign quite substantially. I had left the state, went on a leave of absence, and was on the payroll of the Langlie campaign. As soon as that primary was over, the key people in the Rosellini campaign came to the Langlie people, not only with some money they had made available to the Langlie campaign, but with mailing lists and things of that nature. Why? I’m going to leave their names out, but I heard from a couple of them directly so I know this is the case. They saw their future within the Democrat Party and within the politics of this state far more secure with Rosellini as a Democrat majority leader in the Senate and a Republican governor than with Mitchell as the Democratic governor of this state. In other words, they didn’t see their future, for whatever hidden agendas they had, being very good with Mitchell in the driver’s seat and the leader of the Democratic Party in this state.

The same thing happened in the ’56 race you just mentioned. That’s where it became bitter between Langlie and Eastvold. Eastvold lost to Emmett Anderson as a result. Eastvold brought some of that on himself because of his personal life.

Mr. Scott: Is that why Langlie was opposed to him, as opposed to his office holding capability?

Mr. Schut: No, it was his personal life. It involved a secretary in Langlie’s office, and he was just very angry. Langlie was a very strict moralist; he just felt that Don Eastvold had gone bad and he was very upset about it. When Eastvold lost the primary, the Eastvold people turned right around…I can’t remember the man’s name immediately, but he was a colonel, retired colonel in Tacoma who later became a city manager of Tacoma, and he was his treasurer. I remember very well, that those Eastvold people turned right around and turned a lot of their materials over to Rosellini. The reason was that they felt they’d be better off under Rosellini as governor than Emmett Anderson who had been promoted and supported, although reluctantly, by Art Langlie. That was the reason that Bernie Lontoct, who had been the chief attorney, assistant attorney general under Eastvold,

was promised a job by Rosellini and got it in the Public Service Commission, and later on in that thing in the Department of Licensing. There were two or three other people, I can't remember their names right now, who were Republicans, but who were part of the Eastvold organization, who got appointments from Rosellini when he got elected.

Mr. Scott: Would Don Eastvold have been enough better as a candidate, enough so that he might have changed the outcome of the '56 election, had he been nominated?

Mr. Schut: Eastvold was a far better speaker than Emmett Anderson. Eastvold was a far better administrator than Emmett Anderson. Eastvold had a lot more political knowledge and feel and sense, was much more aggressive and energetic than Emmett Anderson. But Eastvold killed himself. You know, I was a pro-Eastvold guy. Thor Tollefson was being pressured to get into that race and temporarily was in it for a while. I advised strongly against it but he was pushed by Ray Moore, who was then King County Republican chairman, and by a Young Republican who was kind of Ray Moore's and King County's. And a woman from over in Yakima, Virginia Colbert was pro-Eastvold.

In his personal life he just screwed up. He was drinking too much. He got to taking medication in the mornings to snap himself out of it. He got into this mess with that secretary in the governor's office. A womanizer…these things became known about him.

Would he have run a better campaign against Rosellini? I don't know, I'm not so sure of that. If he couldn't beat Emmett Anderson in the primary because he had too much personal baggage, I doubt if he could have won in the finals.

Mr. Scott: Did Rosellini win, or did Emmett Anderson lose?

Mr. Schut: I think it's a combination of both. Emmett Anderson was weak. He wasn't a good public speaker, he wasn't a leader, and he didn't have any political background. He'd been high up in the Elks and the joke around the time of the campaign was, "There's a man that would make a damn good hotel greeter."

Mr. Scott: What did you hear Governor Rosellini concentrating on in that race, and afterward when he began his administration in the winter of '57?

Mr. Schut: He hit pretty hard on the mess in institutions. My recollection of my involvement at that time was that I was for Eastvold in the primary and I got kind of disillusioned toward the end of that primary because of his personal baggage. From then on, I went on to help Thor Tollefson in his re-election. In the finals in '56, where it was Emmett Anderson and Rosellini, I pretty well was aloof from the whole thing.

But Rosellini, by far, put on the better campaign. He was at the factory gates greeting people, he was an aggressive campaigner, he was a friendly fellow, and he knew the issues. Emmett Anderson was ignorant as

far as what really was going on in state government. Rosellini had a great advantage, all those years in the state Legislature, and chair of committees, and majority leader in the Senate, that sort of thing. He'd been around a while and he had a good organization as far as the Democratic Party was concerned. I don't mean that the party organizations were all that good but he had a lot of connections in it, and he put on a far more aggressive campaign, and a better campaign, no question about that. Emmett Anderson just couldn't instill any confidence in himself. People didn't see him as a leader.

Mr. Scott: How would you put Governor Rosellini on the Democratic or on the philosophic spectrum?

Mr. Schut: First, he was a pragmatic person, very much a politician. He would be for issues that he thought he could get political mileage out of, and he would be opposed to some things that he felt he would get political mileage out of for being opposed to. He also was very realistic about what was do-able. In addition to that, because of his background, he was on the liberal side. He was pro-labor, not in how he treated his own help he hired, but pro-labor as far as the philosophical part of it was concerned. He was essentially part and parcel of the Democratic political program. One close person to him described him once to me as being "the kid that grew up on the wrong side of the tracks, always looking enviously at the top of the hill." He wanted to arrive himself, have status, and be recognized in society.

Mr. Scott: There were the complaints made against him by his partisan attackers over the next eight years involving allegations of Swiss bank accounts. There were what some would think were slurs about his ethnic background, which was Italian, and his religion, which was Catholic. To what extent were those purely political slams and to what extent did that baggage have some truth to it?

Mr. Schut: I don't know anything about any Swiss bank account. I knew he was a Catholic because he was Italian. Most of the Italians in those days, anyway, were Catholics. Langlie was deeply religious and had firm convictions, but I didn't see Rosellini that way. He wasn't the kind of a guy that was really pushing it, judging other people, and that sort of thing. I never saw it have any effect in his political activities and maneuverings.

One trait that was bothersome to some people, I remember George Starlin was head of the Public Assistance Department. I remember one time he advocated doing something like taking people on welfare and requiring them to work a certain amount of hours in order to get their welfare benefits. He had talked to me about it, and I said, "You know, that's a highly controversial thing. You're going to have trouble with organized labor about using welfare people to do janitor work when that's supposed to be done under union contract with the Service Employee's Union in counties, cities and parks and the Laborer's Union."

He said, "Well, Al wants it done. Al thinks this is a thing we ought to try."

So it went into effect and there was a big negative reaction to it. Even some of the newspapers raised

Cain about it. And immediately when that negative reaction set in, Rosellini said, "I've got to find out what's going on here. I'm going to check into that and see what Starlin's doing over there."

His next public declaration was that he had looked into it, and had ordered George to discontinue that program. Well, George was a loyal guy; he wasn't going to say anything. But I knew, and George knew, that Rosellini had been the one to request George to put that program into effect in the first place. Now, that's not unusual in the field of politics where the key thing is that you've always got to protect the elected official. The elected official always has to have an escape hatch. You know, I was caught in that thing more than once myself, where a guy got off the hook by saying, "An assistant of mine got carried away on something, I've talked to him about it. That's not our policy any longer, and we're not going to be doing it." Between the two of us, I wasn't doing anything that wasn't fully understood, and known, and encouraged, but it was a "trial balloon" type of a thing.

There was the same kind of a thing with General Administration, where certain practices of a man named of Nelson, I believe, from the Edmonds area, that Rosellini was knowledgeable about. At least everybody at the time who were actors in it told me so. There was some bad publicity. Then Rosellini moved into the picture and said he was looking into it. Shortly after that Nelson resigned as Director of General Administration.

Some people have—I've heard the terms "slippery", "difficult to pin down," "you never know for sure where the guy really stands because he's maneuvering all the time." One time I went into Speaker John O'Brien's office and Joe Davis was with me. It had to do with the legislation for civil service. Rosellini was governor.

I said to John O'Brien—and John was very supportive of it, "You know, the Governor, Rosellini, is strongly supportive of this legislation."

He looked at me, kind of scowled, and he said, "Boy, you're more naïve than I thought you were, young man."

The more things were said, but the impression there was, "Yeah, sure, he's politically saying that, but behind the scenes he's letting the word out that he's not all for that." So there was an impression on the part of a lot of legislators, news media people, people that had dealings with the administration, that this guy was a political maneuverer and manipulator.

Now, that's not necessarily derogatory. He was a politician and facilitator. That's what he did as a majority leader. He kept finessing and massaging and working things all the time. I know there were cases

when I found out later, that I had been in the governor's office on a matter and had reached an understanding with him. Let's say Ed Weston, president of the State Labor Council, was with me, or a committee was with me or something. And in my presence Rosellini called in a director of a department, said he had reached an understanding with me about what he wanted done, and said to proceed to do it.

I found out several years later through the parties directly involved that subsequent to that they got a further phone call from him saying, "Drag your feet on this thing. I was under pressure, and had to handle this thing politically as best I could. Use your own judgment, and slow it down if you can."

Then I'd come back and put on more pressure. I couldn't understand what the hell was going on over there, why they weren't doing something.

The other problem with Rosellini was that a lot of people thought that the guy's word wasn't any good. What happened was that this guy was an artist at saying things without saying things.

This is the biggest problem I've had. I've always had it, and anybody who's a lobbyist has this problem: If you're committed to a program, you're in there representing people, trying to get something accomplished, and you're dealing with the governor, you have a tendency to read into what the governor says more than is really there. You have a tendency to hear what you want to hear, and not hear what you don't want to hear. And so when the guy talks to you in generalities, is very, very warm, and very, very friendly, you go out of there believing because you want to believe. "By god, I got this straightened out. I got a 'yes' out of him." And so on and so forth.

The truth of the matter is, if you were really honest and looked carefully at the whole thing, or if you'd recorded it and gone back and listened to it, you'd find out that that wasn't quite what happened at all. People would go out of those meetings with Rosellini feeling real good. Al, he'd have his arm around you going out of the office, everything was very friendly, and you thought, "What a great guy." Then they'd go back to their people and they'd say, "I had a terrific meeting with the governor. Don't you worry a bit about this. It's all straightened out. We came to a conclusion," which was the case of me or anybody else, overstating the case.

And then the governor wouldn't do it because he hadn't said that—really. You'd get real mad at him. "The god-damned guy. His word's not good." He'd gone back on his word. It really wasn't the truth.

It's awful hard for me to be telling you that right now. I don't like to have to admit that as a lobbyist myself I fell into that trap. But I did. I did it a lot less often than most because I had experience in politics working directly for a governor and working directly for a congressman. I saw this business and how it worked, and I knew in advance that a certain problem was going to be handled in a way where you wouldn't say "yes",

but you wouldn't say "no", and it would leave various interpretations.

Mr. Scott: Who were the strong personalities in the Rosellini administration?

Mr. Schut: The first one that comes to mind is Dr. Garrett Heyns. He had a daughter living out here. He was in Michigan and had tremendous experience in the correctional and institutional field. He was interested, and was eligible for his retirement back there. He was interested in coming out here where his daughter was living in Lacey.

Rosellini wanted him. I don't know who recommended him but he heard that Heyns might be available. Heyns did a terrific job in Institutions. He was the best director of Institutions this state has ever had before or since. Not only was he a very strong leader in Institutions, but he was very strong in dealing with the governor.

I remember one instance where I ran into it. Rosellini had planted a guy, a private detective, on the payroll at Western State Hospital to spy on other employees. I don't know what all the purposes were, but I found out about it. From a union standpoint, it made me madder than hell. I went to Garrett Heyns about it. He found out that, without his knowledge, Ben De Julio did it at Rossellini's knowledge and request.

Mr. Scott: For what reason?

Mr. Schut: I don't know what all the reasons were, but he was planted in there as a spy for the administration, maybe to get some information on some people to fire so they could replace them with their own appointments. There were some other things going on, that I'll get to in a minute, affecting a business manager who finally went to jail that Rosellini had appointed, who had been his Pierce County campaign treasurer.

The point I want to tell you about Garrett Heyns is, when I got through telling him that and showed him the evidence of it, he got right up out of his chair, stomped right across the street, went over to Rossellini's office, and got in to see him immediately. By five o'clock that night the detective was off the payroll and the governor had apologized for the thing. Heyns didn't take any crap from anybody. He didn't have to.

Rosellini had some appointments that had been made in Institutions of a partisan political nature. He was very loyal to the people who supported him, no question about that, where Langlie wasn't into making political appointments, particularly higher level ones.

When Garrett Heyns found that these people were incompetent and not doing their job, he didn't take any crap. He said, "That guy's got to go. If you want him politically hired, you hire him some other place. I don't want him at Western State Hospital. I don't want him as superintendent of the Veterans Home at Retsil." Or whatever the situation was. And Garrett Heyns got his way.

Rosellini under no circumstances wanted a break with Garrett Heyns. Garrett Heyns did one hell of a swell job for Institutions, and he had the backing of Rosellini in doing it. Rosellini put far more money into

Institutions and gave them a far higher priority than had ever happened in my lifetime.

Warren Bishop was a very fine man to work with. I didn't know anything about him prior to his coming on the scene, except I started hearing things about him after he got there. What I heard about him was all favorable: a competent guy, well trained, honest, committed, dedicated, and so on. I found him a very honorable person to work with. I never had any question in my mind about his saying one thing and meaning another. He wasn't that kind of a politician. He was an administrator. I believed him. He was honest, always fair, and he sometimes told me things off the record. I never betrayed a confidence with him because it was for my own good that he told me. He told me things that he didn't approve of either, but that he wasn't in a position to do anything about. But he was honest with me. I had the highest respect for Warren Bishop; he was a good one.

Mr. Scott: Former Speaker Charlie Hodde was in the administration. What roles did he play?

Mr. Schut: He was over at the Tax Commission, and he did some special trouble shooting for Rosellini on occasion. I didn't have too much to do with Charles Hodde. He gave Rosellini advice, but Rosellini didn't need advice on political strategy. Rosellini was sharp enough to figure that out for himself. So I'm sure he listened to him and used him as a contact with the Grange in eastern Washington. But I didn't see Charles Hodde as that strong a guy in the administration.

Mr. Scott: Was there more or less political patronage under Rosellini than there had been during the Langlie administration?

Mr. Schut: That's hard to say, by comparison. I know that I can talk about the Department of Labor and Industries. When Langlie came in, the place was a mess. There was a big backlog of work. It was because the Democrats who Wallgren had appointed into positions in Labor and Industries were all made to work—or they volunteered—some insisted later that they were forced to work in the Wallgren campaign. They were so out-in-the open about it—the safety inspectors and people like that—when Wallgren lost they all took off. They didn't even wait around. All those jobs were filled by Republicans, people who had been part of the Langlie administration the first time around. John Shaughnesy and Ron McClain—I could name an awful lot of them. Langlie was partisan, but not so much partisan-political as partisan-Langlie.

When Rosellini came into office, there wasn't any civil service system in Labor and Industries and in Institutions. I got Langlie to put it into effect through an executive order. It did not have the effect of law; it was an executive order. From then on out, we had a personnel board for Labor and Industries made up of Boyd Wickwire from industry, Art Hare from the Service Employees Union, and Frank Musket representing

the Department. They heard appeals, firings. The institutions were brought under the State Personnel Board by executive order.

One of the early things Rosellini did was to cancel those executive orders. He then started bringing people in through political patronage. One good example of that was at Western State Hospital, when one day I got a call, and a hundred and twenty people in maintenance and those types of jobs at Western State Hospital had suddenly gotten a notice. They were fired. They were fired purely to make room for Democrats. The Democrats were all cleared. The people came out to be interviewed for the jobs by the Democratic Central Committee and by the Service Employees Union in Tacoma, which was tied in with the Democratic Central Committee.

I went in to see Rosellini, and Ed Weston went with me, because all of those hundred and twenty people were members of our union. This was a labor issue with us. Dr. Shoven was the Superintendent of Institutions. The thing I used as the final club with Rosellini was that the law was quite clear; the Superintendent was the appointing authority. The courts had held that to a point that Shoven had the control over firing, and he refused to sign the order dismissing these people.

He said, "You have to fire me. I'm not going to sign this."

For a while even business managers signed the dismissals. That wasn't a legitimate dismissal because they had no authority to hire or fire. Mainly it was a labor issue. By the time I got out of Rosellini's office that afternoon with Ed Weston, he had taken the steps in our presence to cancel those terminations. Those people were not fired, and the ones that were being sent in were not hired. So Rosellini was very partisan in that respect. In the case of the one hundred and twenty that got the notice, they hadn't been involved in politics at all. Those were institution jobs that weren't so glamorous that they were being politically rewarded.

In Labor and Industries also, Rosellini proceeded after the executive order was canceled to hire a bunch of people that had been previously with the Wallgren administration, safety inspectors and that sort of thing. He did that quite a bit. I can't remember the timeframe on this, but it seems to me that the civil service initiative was finally launched successfully in 1960.

Mr. Scott: That's correct.

Mr. Schut: And Rosellini came in office in'57, didn't he?

Mr. Scott: That's right.

Mr. Schut: Next, we negotiated with him about the exemptions from civil service in the executive branch of government, so that he wouldn't be opposed to the Civil Service Initiative. He had a lot of his people

appointed, so they would get grandfathered into that Civil Service Initiative. In the case of the Department of Institutions, there were only two exemptions from civil service. That was the Director of Institutions and his confidential secretary. The person who insisted on it and got away with it with Rosellini was Dr. Garrett Heyns.

He said, "I've had a belly full of the political patronage crap I've had to put up with already here. I don't want anymore of it, and as far as I'm concerned, I only want myself and my confidential secretary exempted, and I want to be able to hire everybody else on the basis of merit. That means I can recruit legitimately. People will know that they're going to be considered and evaluated based on their qualifications for the job." He was talking about professional people primarily, in that respect.

Mr. Scott: What was the governor's position as you were forwarding the idea of the Civil Service Initiative?

Mr. Schut: Whether it was Langlie or Rosellini, in private conversations I've had with both of them, they both said they had to be careful because of political problems they've had over the civil service issue within their own parties. If I were to be successful in getting civil service established in the state of Washington, it would be the biggest damn favor I ever did for them because they got into more trouble as a chief executive over the political appointments they made that went sour than on anything else. This would take them out from under one hell of a lot of pressure.

If they could say to the central committee in a given county, or the political campaign workers, "Look, you know it's out of my hands. I can't control this. I'll make good recommendations for you, but you've got to take the examination, you've got to be rated, you've got to compete, and you'll be hired based on your merit. If there are three qualified people for that position and one of them is a Democrat, I'm going to do everything I can to see that the Democrat gets appointed, but you've got to be qualified."

Mr. Scott: Langlie had initiated some civil service procedures by executive order. Governor Rosellini canceled those, at least. Both men were not unfavorable to civil service, but were they under political constraints, and thus not full supporters?

Mr. Schut: What they would tell me privately was that civil service was the best instrument they had available to hide behind, to get out from under all of that political pressure of political jobs. People who worked in campaigns would take a state payroll, then go down and look at salaries. They'd pick a salary they'd like, and see what the title was with it. They would convince themselves they were qualified for that job, and then they would make a run for it.

I ran into that same thing with Congressman Tollefson where the postmaster jobs were political patronage. The congressman had the control over that within his own congressional district. That's not true

anymore at all. And you know what happened? Like Sumner, there were five people who were contestants for that postmaster's job. All five had been people who had been helpful to the congressman, but only one of them could get the appointment. As soon as that one got the appointment, he was going to be a damn good postmaster, he couldn't get involved in any politics anymore, and you lost him. Then the other four were madder than hell at you because they didn't get the appointment. Both of these governors told me privately on more than one occasion, patronage was a bitch. It was the worst thing they had to deal with. They liked some leeway in the very top jobs but as far as the rank-and-file and middle income positions went, they were happy to see civil service come.

Mr. Scott: There's official correspondence that indicates that Joe Davis, then the number-two man in the Washington State Federation of Labor, wanted the job of director of Labor and Industries, and he didn't get it. What's the story there?

Mr. Schut: All I know is that Ed Weston, president of the Washington State Federation of Labor, was very angry when Joe didn't get it. He blasted Rosellini in the press over it and Rosellini blasted back. In fact, he was highly critical at the State Labor Council convention following that, accusing Rosellini of being a liar and going back on his word. I was in Joe Davis' home on a Sunday morning for breakfast visiting with Weston, when he got a call from Rosellini.

All Rosellini would tell him was, "I've come to the conclusion it's not possible for me to appoint you. You're too closely tied to the Federation of Labor, and that's causing problems other places. While I did lead you to believe I was going to appoint you, I've reviewed the thing carefully and I just can't appoint you, Joe."

It was a very short conversation. Joe was quite angry at the time, disappointed, and let down. The first thing Joe said to me was, "I know the Teamsters have really been pouring the heat on Rosellini. There are elements within the CIO who don't want an AFL guy appointed director of Labor and Industries."

Mr. Scott: What was Governor Rosellini' relationship with labor thereafter?

Mr. Schut: It was pretty good in many respects, but he ran into some real problems within his own administration. One case in point was Art Hare of the Building Service Employee's Union. I never did know all the details, but it had to do with Art Hare representing the civilian employees of the State National Guard. He had organized them and had some grievances. He felt Rosellini had double-crossed them, and was a rat and a fink. He really carried on. Whenever Rosellini came up with an endorsement from the State Labor Council, Art Hare was on the floors like screaming, "Gimme!" Really blasting the guy.

There were other areas where he had some problems with organized labor, but by and large, he always supported what labor wanted in the Legislature—unemployment comp, workmen's compensation, things of that

nature. He was one of the most conservative governors I ever dealt with on state employee matters. He was tight. He was conservative. That came out true later in the problems he had in his own private business when he wasn't governor any longer, where he ran into labor, and the Teamsters went on strike against him, putting up pickets.

Mr. Scott: Did that conservatism extend into other areas?

Mr. Schut: It wasn't unusual at all. I found this in case after case, where a politician in office would be liberal as hell about what private industry wanted to do in dealing with their own employees, and quite difficult to deal with when it came to his own employees. He would be very liberal on unemployment comp, minimum wage, a lot of things in the private sector, collective bargaining—very pro-labor. That was the political stance of the Democratic Party. Some Republicans would be the same way as what they thought private industry wanted. Then you had to deal with them on how they treated their own employees, and it was a different ballgame. I was able to use this very effectively, politically. The people I dealt with who were elected officials soon became aware of this, and it made a difference in my relations with them.

Just imagine the effectiveness of my getting on the floor of the State Labor Council and saying, "The acid test on where a man stands on labor issues is how he treats his own employees. If you people had your boss of your saw mill do this, this, and this to you, how would you react to it?"

And, of course, I'd get this response, "You know damn well how they would react to it."

"Let me tell you, this is exactly what's happening to us. While this governor is saying these things about labor's rights and how employers ought to treat them, we're having some real problems with him as to how he's treating his own employees. I repeat to you, brothers and sisters, the acid test is: how does the guy treat his own employees?"

I always won that argument, George, because you can't help but win it.

Mr. Scott: What else was conspicuous about the Rosellini administration, either in terms of what it did or what it did not do?

Mr. Schut: I largely credit Garrett Heyns, but then the governor had to be supportive, and the governor was the one that hired Garrett Heyns. I think Institutions got, by far, the biggest boost of anytime that I can remember. During the Rosellini administration, they needed help. They needed it badly. It was during the Rosellini administration that better financing for Institutions occurred. The emphasis started going to treatment and rehabilitation, instead of just locking them up in custody. Of course, it was changing all over the country, so maybe it wasn't just an isolated thing. An accomplishment of the Rosellini administration was the tremendous

improvement in institutional care and institutional programming in the state of Washington, no question about that.

Mr. Scott: In Rosellini's administration, there was also an effort characterized by some as an attempt to "pack" the Liquor Board by raising its numbers and changing the personnel. How did labor react to that? How did you react to it?

Mr. Schut: Labor was involved. It was an issue that involved the liquor industry. Our union wasn't involved with the Liquor Board, period. The stores were organized during the Langlie administration by the Retail Clerks Union. That was before I was with the State Employee's Union. I encouraged it and helped, even though I was a Langlie administration employee. I don't know that labor felt anything one way or the other.

Mr. Scott: Are there other areas where there were conspicuous accomplishments by the administration?

Mr. Schut: Yes. Rosellini was the first one to ask for the creation of the Department of Commerce and Economic Development. He saw the benefits of a tourism program for the state of Washington.

There was a case where organized labor had always looked at the Department of Labor and Industries as its department. Historically, there was always a person from organized labor, starting with Art Langlie in 1940, appointed as director of it. That's another thing that made labor mad. Rosellini appointed a non-labor person when he decided not to appoint Joe Davis, rather than to appoint a labor person from some other faction.

Business never felt it had a department of its own they could go to, one that was interested in the development of business. So when Rosellini came along, he got the Legislature to establish the Department of Commerce and Economic Development. I think the first director he appointed was a guy by the name of Dwayne Kreager.

Mr. Scott: How strong was he?

Mr. Schut: Labor got mad at him on several occasions because he was siding with industry on some of the labor legislation before the Legislature, and that made labor mad. They would go to Rosellini and say, "If you don't call that son-of-a-bitch off… You're supposed to be supporting our stuff, and he's in there advising industry on how to deal with the Legislature."

Mr. Scott: Governor Rosellini attempted a third term in the 1964 race. Did he get resistance in his own party?

Mr. Schut: One of the things that hurt him badly was, prior to his announcing that he was going to run for the third term, John J. O'Connell, who was the Democrat Attorney General, announced that he was interested in running for governor. He thought Rosellini would do the state a disservice in running for a third term. It was more of an issue then than it is now about how a governor shouldn't have more than two terms, and about how

"it's building a political machine." O'Connell kept pounding away at that, and finally when Rosellini came out full-score and said he was going to run for re-election and for a third term, John J. O'Connell got cold feet and backed out.

Then Evans came along, and the Republicans used that in the 1964 campaign against Rosellini. This business—the issue of the third term—oddly enough, eight years later, here's Evans who used that issue of running a third term. Rosellini said, "What about this third term issue?"

Mr. Scott: That would have been in 1972 when the two men had the nominations again.

Mr. Schut: What I can say about 1964 is that, actually, as far as our union was concerned, we weren't out there in the open with an endorsement because I was opposed to the State Employee's Union endorsing a gubernatorial candidate. I said, "Both sides can make their statement. We'll mail it to all of our members."

But privately, I was supporting Al Rosellini. Even though I had had a number of problems with him, and at times found it difficult to pin him down—these things I'd talked to you earlier about—I supported him because of Institutions, because of the tremendous gains that had been made in every facet of Institutions.

I had problems with Dan Evans on occasions when he was in the House of Representatives. He was from a silk-stocking Republican district; he didn't understand labor issues, and he didn't have that kind of a background. He was more of a conservative Republican in those days.

I was surprised that Evans got the nomination. Then, of course the campaign against Rosellini was "Taxalini." I remember it very well. The guy had raised taxes and "was a spender." And yet, of course, the record will show that during the Evans administration there were a series of tax increases that occurred. That always happens. I remember Langlie made a big issue in the '48 campaign about how the state payroll had grown under Mon Wallgren, and that Langlie was going to reduce it by, I can't remember the figure, like four-hundred thousand or something. At the end of the four years of Langlie's administration, there were two thousand more employees than there had been under the Wallgren administration. It was inevitable, because the state was growing, because the new programs came into effect. It's no clever, chintzy deal. It was just that the governors sincerely make a promise like that, but they can't keep it. It's not their fault. And the same goes with the taxes.

Mr. Scott: Was Evans philosophically different as a legislator than he was a governor, and if so, why?

Mr. Schut: Yes, I had problems with Evans as a legislator. Nothing open and confrontational type of thing, but his voting record was not good on our stuff. He had a limited perspective. You know, he was from that silk-stocking district. He was a professional guy, a college graduate, an engineer, and I had problems with him

from his first year as governor. We had a few clashes, but I saw an amazing thing happen with Evans. When he became governor, and became suddenly involved in the problems of all of the people of the state, when he represented all of the state and no longer that small silk-stocking district, a new Dan Evans began to emerge.

By the second year of his administration, I found that I liked the guy very much because he was so damned honest. I never had any problem in figuring out what he meant when he said something to me. That didn't mean he was going to agree with me. I'd come into the governor's office and make my pitch, and he'd listen to me. He was very analytical. He knew more about those state agencies than any governor I ever worked with before. He really made it a point to know what was going on as a manager, there's just no question about that. He would hear me out and ask very pertinent questions. Then finally, at the end of it, he would say, "I'm not going to agree to that, no way." I'd know that there was no Mickey Mouse-ing about. He wouldn't take it "under consideration," nor lead me to believe that maybe I'd partially convinced him or something. It was a very straight-arrow type of a thing.

He became more and more moderate, more and more people-oriented, the longer he stayed as governor. I'd say it was during the second year that this relationship developed. I had had a very close personal relationship with Langlie that had started before he was governor, because I was in his campaign. But I developed a very close personal relationship with Dan Evans. He and I worked jointly on a lot of things. We had a relationship where, if he spotted or heard things that had to do with employees or with our union, he'd call me in privately. He'd say, "I think you may have some trouble in the future with this." Or, "I'm hearing some things that I don't particularly like, Norm. What is it you're doing out there?"

On the other hand, if I was traveling around and I spotted problems in a state institution that could lead to some political problems for him, I would go in to see him and I'd tell him, "Dan, you got a problem, and here's what it is." And he would get on it right now, and nip it in the bud. We respected each other, we trusted each other. It was a mutually beneficial relationship, and I thought he was the best damn governor this state ever had.

Starting with Langlie, all the way through to the present governor, I still think Dan Evans was the best governor I ever had anything to do with. I hadn't supported him when he initially ran at all. As I told you, I had problems with him the first year of his administration. But that man really grew, he grew in that office.

Mr. Scott: What was the governor's management style?

Mr. Schut: My observation was that, number one, he was fully in control. He knew what was going on throughout all of state government. He made the final decisions, and he damn well made sure they were

implemented. There were no three or four different viewpoints, three and four different things being done, or something being done without his knowledge.

Secondly, he would hear you out. Before he made a decision on a matter or if after he made a decision you disagreed with it, you were never refused an opportunity to see him. I don't know that any of his directors were afraid to talk to him. I never heard that kind of a comment from anybody. He would very carefully listen to what you had to say. The people who were hesitant to go in and talk to him were the people who were weak, the people who hadn't done their homework, the people who weren't competent.

If you went into him with a half-assed or half-baked idea, he was going to spot it right now. This guy had a sharp analytical mind. He would ask penetration questions, and you'd just better have answers. He was the kind of a guy that wanted all the facts. He was an engineer. He was meticulous in getting details; he wanted to hear it out. He asked all kinds of probing questions. When he finally made a decision that was the policy of the administration. I don't think he put up with any department head going a different direction from the policy he had established. I was never a party to his ever dressing anybody down or ever firing anybody, so you'll have to talk to somebody else about that. The man was very knowledgeable, he was open, and you could talk to him. He was stubborn in some respects, but you could talk to him. He was running the show. There was no question in my mind or anybody else's that when Dan Evans was governor, he was governor.

Mr. Scott: In 1965, he saw to it that Gummie Johnson was appointed state party chair for the Republicans, and soon opened a war against the Birchites in the party first, but the right wing generally. Given that, how much did he succeed as a party leader?

Mr. Schut: Not very well. He had his problems as far as the Republican Party was concerned. He also was very strong in his position in support of civil service. He felt on several occasions he needed a little more flexibility at the higher level. I would hear him out and work out a compromise with him. Some more positions were made exempt at the higher level as far as the Personnel Board or a change in the law was concerned. I would acquiesce to and support him in the Legislature, but this guy's key word was competence. He wanted competence in people. He wasn't about to put up with a political appointee that didn't have it.

Mr. Scott: Was the war on the right, the party schism, necessary?

Mr. Schut: I don't know. The problem a guy like Dan Evans runs into, and I've seen this before in other political leaders, is that he started out as conservative, a reliable type of a conservative as far as the party conservatives were concerned, as a legislator. Then he grew into something far different—a progressive, open-minded guy.

Evans came as being a conservative himself as a legislator, and evolved into what I would call a progressive. They considered him a traitor. The same thing happened within the Democratic Party, where a liberal Democrat for whatever pragmatic reasons, mostly hard facts, will evolve from a liberal to a moderate or moderate conservative. And then the liberals in his party think he's a traitor, and they get real bitter and sore about it.

That happened to Dan Evans. As he became the environmentalist, some of the industry people got upset about it. He was a very good governor to deal with as far as labor relations were concerned with his own staff. As a union, we liked him because he was a fair guy to deal with. Some of his own directors were upset with him. They thought he was giving away the store; they thought they should have more freedom to make decisions unilaterally, rather than to have to sit down with the Labor Management Committee on those issues and work them out. And so, part of the problem Evans had with the conservatives, both in the Legislature and within the political party, was that they didn't like the fact that he used to be like them and had changed into something that was far different.

Welfare issues were the same way. He became much more aware of what the real problems were out there after he had been governor for a while. He was recommending solutions to the Legislature that Republicans historically had been opposed to.

Mr. Scott: How did he use Jim Dolliver as chief of staff and his staff generally?

Mr. Schut: I don't know so much about their personal relationship. As far as how much influence did Jim Dolliver have in the final analysis, I know that Jim Dolliver played a major role. There were instances in my case where I would go in and talk it all over with Jim Dolliver, and Jim Dolliver would advise me on what the best approach was for me to make to Dan Evans. There were occasions when Jim Dolliver would go in with me and back up my arguments with Dan Evans. Jim Dolliver was more liberal, more progressive than Dan Evans. He had more of a social conscience at that time than Dan Evans started out with, anyway. Jim Dolliver was a very warm person, a very compassionate type of person, where Evans was more of a colder personality, more of an engineering type—more facts and figures, and less human instincts. I think Jim Dolliver must have had a tremendous leveling influence, and gave the Evans administration more of a human face, a warmth to it than it probably would have had otherwise. I think Dan Evans trusted Jim Dolliver completely, and I think that's a hell of an important thing in a relationship between a governor and his chief of staff. I like Jim Dolliver very much to this day, and I have a very high regard for Jim Dolliver as a person.

Mr. Scott: Who else did you deal with, and what were the results of those dealings? Any conspicuous policy

questions that stand out?

Mr. Schut: I would deal with a director during the Evans administration on the basis that if the director and I couldn't arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on a matter, I was going over his head to the governor. I always knew that the governor's door was open and that I could deal with the governor on it. There were just as many cases where he overruled his own directors, or there were cases when he stood with his director and refused to accede to my viewpoint on the matter.

The point is, he was such a strong governor that I dealt with him more than I ever did any of his directors. If I wanted a basic matter settled, if I didn't want it settled just in one agency, I would go to the governor and we would hash it out. We would work something out; then he would call his directors in his staff meeting or cabinet meeting, and he would say to them, "This is it." That's when sometimes he'd get guff from them.

They'd say, "You're giving away the store. Schut's having too much influence with you."

I always religiously tried every effort, if it was a matter within the department, to work it out within the department, always on the basis that if I couldn't work it out within that department I was going to go see the governor. I felt that was proper. After all, the buck stops with the governor. He's the governor and he's got the final say.

Mr. Scott: Who were the strong personalities apart from Jim Dolliver? Walt Howe was there as budget director early on…

Mr. Schut: Walt Howe was the attorney for Dan Evans in Dan Evan's own office. I got acquainted with him there. He then was the budget director. He is a very honorable person. To this day, the guy still sends me a Christmas card every year. When Spellman got elected governor, it was Walt Howe who called and asked if I would serve on a five-member budget transition team for John Spellman. Over a period of years, I had a good relationship with Walt Howe, a very high-caliber person, very honest, very sincere, intellectually qualified.

Mr. Scott: Who were the administration's problem children?

Mr. Schut: That I don't know. One of his very good administrators was Sid Smith. Sid Smith started out as the director of the Employment Security Department. Then Evans transferred him over into DSHS. He was well liked by the employees in DSHS. We had a perfect relationship with him. When there was a problem they wanted to hash out, we would invite him to come to the meeting. He gave us his viewpoint and answered questions readily. He was very open, very accessible, very pragmatic, and he also had a feel for those programs that were in there. I learned this later about the guy, that he had grown up in an AFDC family and the he wasn't

just a silk-stocking Republican who had grown up under middle class circumstances at the least. He was a very good director. I have very high regard for him.

Mr. Scott: Toward the end of the administration, Evans installed Charles Morris in that job. Charles was touted as a "wunderkind." How good was he?

Mr. Schut: He came out of New York, as I recall. Yes, he was a good administrator, and did a lot of good innovative things in getting that department better structured. He didn't like very much having to deal with advisory committees. There was always some friction going on between advisory committees that the governor appointed because the law said that you had to have advisory committees. Charlie Morris would deal with the advisory committees as if they were a necessary evil, something you wanted out of your hair. You put up with them, but you didn't take them seriously. He was a capable administrator, there's no question about that. That was a hallmark of Evans' administration. He made it a point to find and appoint competent people.

I don't know how he went about appointing people, but there was more than one occasion when either Jim Dolliver or Dan Evans would say to me, "One of the people we have under consideration for a certain job is so-and-so, and he's currently in a certain position in Pennsylvania. Can you, through your union connections, run a trapline for us? We're getting information from a number of sources, but we run into the problem that if I contact a governor, the governor may tell me nothing but all the favorable stuff about somebody. Maybe the governor isn't all that happy with the guy and sees this as the chance for me to have him instead of the governor. You know, the current one has to keep him. What can you find out?"

And I did this.

I remember one case in particular. I think it may have been the DSHS appointment after Morris. The fellow was a black, he was in the state of Pennsylvania, and he was highly regarded as far as the resume and other things that Evans had found out. But Evans said, "See what you can find out, just quietly on your own."

I found out from our people through the international union that the guy had real problems in dealing with the Legislature, that the Legislature viewed him as being a little arrogant and pushy, and that there'd been some bad incidents. So I reported that back to Evans and Evans checked further himself. He told me later that the reason he didn't appoint the guy, in checking further himself, that really was so. No one else had told him that before. All I'm telling you there is that the guy made every effort to find out as much information from as many sources as possible before he just blindly went in and appointed somebody.

The other thing I think is important is that because he worked so hard at being governor, and because he tried to stay on top of things as much as he did, that was a real motivating factor to his directors. They knew

that you weren't going to last with him very long in this setup if you slept on the job, or if you were careless, or if you didn't use good judgment in your decisions, or if you got lazy. Evans was a driver.

Mr. Scott: What should be noted as Dan Evans' chief accomplishment?

Mr. Schut: I don't know whether it's the chief accomplishment or not, but one that sticks in my mind is that Evans was the planner and the builder. The mansion was in a mess. I'd been in the mansion, even stayed there part of the time when Langlie was governor. The plumbing was lousy, the electrical wiring was terrible. Nobody ever did anything about it. They just put up with it. But he took the bull by the horns, and it got controversial. He was criticized by the press, but, by god, that mansion was put in tip-top shape, and the addition was built on for private living quarters.

He really went to town as far as building state buildings were concerned, and was real involved in the engineering and the planning and everything of those buildings. He was a planner and a builder and he started the "Blueprint for Progress." He was a thinker. He was innovative. He was methodical. I can't tell you off-hand how much of the campus that's there right now came during the Evans administration, but a hell of a lot of it did.

Mr. Scott: Can we now move to the administration of Governor Dixy Lee Ray who succeeded Governor Evans in the January of 1977? How did the inside of that administration work?

Mr. Schut: Let me first tell you about my relationship with Dixy Lee Ray. I was not involved in anybody's campaign then. I was with the senior citizens at that point, a volunteer, retired. Blair Butterworth got hold of me and wanted me to sit down and talk with Dixy Lee Ray. I'd never met her before in my life, so I stopped on my way home from Seattle one day and went to an apartment in Tacoma. It was a small apartment building owned by Dr. Harlan McNutt. She had the bottom unit. That's where her campaign headquarters were.

I spent a whole afternoon with her, and realized how totally naïve she was on a lot of state issues. She had no knowledge of state government as far as the agencies, what their programs were, and that sort of thing.

In that campaign, Wes Uhlman met with me on several occasions to pump my brain. John Spellman and Dixy Lee Ray did, too. I met with them because other people asked me to do this. They were asking me about problems in state government. They were asking me about people in particular—what I knew about certain people, contacts in the news media. They were asking me about political issues and their ramifications. I made it clear to all three of them that I wasn't involved in anybody's campaign, and that I would answer questions honestly. And that's what I did.

What I'm merely saying is that I quickly became aware of the fact that Dixy Lee Ray was a neophyte as far as state government was concerned. In fact, as far as knowing what the hell was going on in this state, she

had been with the Pacific Science Center. That's a narrow kind of a thing. Then she went back to Washington, D.C., and was there with the Atomic Energy Commission. But she just didn't have any, really, roots in the state of Washington as far as the issues that state government deals with. She was totally naïve about a legislative body, and how a chief executive relates to a legislative body. She even asked me to write some speeches for her which I did. Anybody else who'd have asked me, I would have done so as a favor. That's no problem because I said honest things in them, at least as far as my viewpoint was concerned.

When she was elected governor, Paul Bender, chief of staff to Governor Ray, got hold of me. I didn't know him before. He said he had been back as her chief of staff with the Atomic Energy Commission, that he didn't know much about state government. He knew that she didn't know much about state government, and he wanted to know if I would, from time to time, sit down and have rap sessions with them. I remember a couple of times we met at a restaurant in Lakewood. So I got quite involved with her administration on a lot of matters. She even talked to me about whether she should call a special session at one time.

Let me say these things quickly about her. She was a Dr. Jekyll and Mrs. Hyde, if I ever saw one. First, on the positive side, we got more accomplished for senior citizens in her four years as governor than at any other time in the history of the state, before or since. All the major breakthroughs came during her administration.

Mr. Scott: She played a major role in that?

Mr. Schut: She was very supportive. She would have conferences set up on Saturdays, every other Saturday around the state, on a community college campus. She came to every one of them. She spent the whole morning with those senior citizens. She was very friendly. She was very affable. She was just great! Just a real part of the people, so to speak; she'd be lovable, they'd hug her, and she'd hug them back.

On the other hand, she had that other side of her person. She could be as vindictive as hell. If somebody crossed her, or she got upset with somebody, she could really go on the attack and be personally vindictive. So she had those two sides of her personality. As far as my relationship with her was concerned, it was very open. I never hesitated to tell her exactly what I thought about a matter, and tell her to her face that she was doing the wrong things. She would flinch, and she would take it, but it never bothered my relationship. It was always a very good one. She was temperamentally unsuited to be governor. That was the big problem.

More than that, I think, was the problem that she was considered an outsider by the Democratic Party, and the Democratic Party people resented the fact that she got elected governor on the Democratic Party ticket. She had not paid her dues in any way, shape, or form. She had never been a part of the Legislature, as Evans

and Rosellini had. She had never had any experiences dealing with them at all. She got a little paranoid in that regard, in that she saw the Legislature as people hiding in the bushes waiting to pounce on her. As far as she was concerned, the less amount they spent in Olympia, the better off the state would be.

In fairness to her, while she had her problems within her administration, and there were temperamental problems, she had the problem of people in the Legislature that thought they were far more qualified to be governor than she was. There was John Bagnariol openly saying he was going to run for governor. There was Jim McDermott who was saying openly he was going to run for governor. They were second-guessing her. They were carping at her.

I told her one time in a meeting I had with her what the problem was. "You're all damn fools, all three of you. You just remind me of the situation of my dog and the neighborhood. It's in the evening. My dog's barking out there. I get him shut up, and then the other dogs will shut up. Then right when I'm willing to bring my dog in the house, one of the other dogs has to get a last bark in. Then, shit, all three of the dogs start barking again. Well, I see now ol' Bagnariol makes a remark, and what do you do? You rise to the bait right now. You say something, and McDermott rises to the bait. You're like three dogs, not getting anything accomplished out of it all, and it's demeaning to you."

She'd listen to that, and finally agree to it, but then she couldn't have her resistance business. She was feisty. She couldn't have her resistance business, and if somebody was critical of her, really getting sharp tongued and caustic back…some of the things she said to me privately about what she thought of certain people in the news media aren't printable. She could be very vindictive and very bitter about things.

Some of the appointments she made for state government in her administration were not good. Joe Zaspell, Governor Ray's legislative liaison, was one of them. He had been a TV reporter covering the Legislature. But he didn't know anything about the legislative process, how you get things done, how you go about lobbying for a governor's program, and that sort of a thing. It was looked upon by the legislators as a joke.

Harlan McNutt was a close personal friend of hers. I had known the guy for some time. He's an affable guy. I was very much surprised when she appointed him director of DSHS. That was too big a job for him. He'd been a Pierce County health director, but that job was over his head. He didn't have the managerial skills to do it.

You see, it was her lack of knowledge of state government, and it was her lack of knowledge of the executive branch's relationship to the legislative branch that was a tremendous problem with her. You don't

deal with the press like you deal with students in your classroom when you're a professor. That became another problem.

Mr. Scott: Ray had been an administrator at the Science Center. She knew people like Eddie Carlson.

Mr. Schut: They were really instrumental in getting her to run.

Mr. Scott: She had been an administrator at the AEC.

Mr. Schut: But she had problems in those places. Paul Bender told me that she had been a difficult person to work for at the Atomic Energy Commission. There were times when the commissioners weren't speaking with each other because of the sparks that she had caused to fly.

Mr. Scott: You were talking a little bit about the Democratic campaign for governor in 1976.

Mr. Schut: As the campaign wore on, as I observed it, Dixy Lee Ray began to slip a little because the newness wore off. People were beginning to ask second questions, and Uhlman began to close in on her. The thing that hurt Uhlman was that Marvin Durning got the support of the WEA because he came out flat-footed in support of a graduated income tax and tax reform. He got about twice as many votes as the polls had originally showed that he was going to get, and it cut into Uhlman. It didn't take any votes away from Dixy Lee Ray; it took votes away from Wes Uhlman. So she got the nomination because a split of the votes occurred.

Mr. Scott: Why did Governor Ray run as a Democrat when her philosophic stance was more typical of a Republican?

Mr. Schut: I can't answer that from the standpoint that I didn't know anything about her, or meet her until after she was declared candidate on the Democratic ticket. All I know is that she was politically advised by Eddie Carlson and others to run for governor. And that in view of what the state of Washington was like, the smart thing to do would be to run as a Democrat.

Mr. Scott: Let's talk about John Spellman, first as a campaigner.

Mr. Schut: In the first campaign, when he got the nomination against Dixy Lee Ray, there just wasn't any enthusiasm for John Spellman's campaign. A guy by the name of Joe McGavick got hold of me one day. I'd been a friend of his when he was in the Legislature, a Republican in the House, and wanted me to meet with this Spellman. Spellman asked me point blank one time, "You tell me my campaign's lackluster. What do you want me to do?"

And I said, "Geez." I'm trying to think like maybe, jump off a five-story building in your shorts or something. "You're just not putting anybody on fire. They think you're lackluster, and they don't know what the hell you really stand for."

As a county executive it was kind of the same way. It was his personality. He just didn't light anybody up. He didn't turn anybody on.

Mr. Scott: Did Spellman ever understand the Legislature? He had come out of a nine-man King County Council. Did he have that intuition that's necessary to make a good governor? Political intuition?

Mr. Schut: That's hard for me to answer, because one of the problems I had with John Spellman was that I never knew for sure when he said, "Okay, we've got this issue, we're dealing with the Legislature on it, and I'll tell you now I'm drawing the line here."

I'd say, "Okay governor, that means then, that from the senior citizen's standpoint on this issue, I can make it clear that we're not going to retreat beyond this point, and this is it. We're going to fight it out."

Two weeks later the line was back here. And then the line was back here. I don't know whether he lacked guts, whether he lacked understanding, or what the deal was. Mainly, as far as the Legislature was concerned, he knew they had a problem.

There was a big contest about who would be his legislative aide. One of the guys interested in it was Dr. Robert G. Waldo from the University of Washington. He made a strong pitch for it. I wrote a letter of recommendation, and even privately talked to Spellman on behalf of Waldo. But for whatever reason, he appointed Duane Berentson. Duane Berentson had run against him in the primary and had lost, but had run a damn good race. Duane Berentson had been a Co-Speaker of the House. So Spellman ended up pretty much turning over dealing with the Legislature to Duane Berentson. That caused problems within the administration in that Spellman's staff didn't have a lot of regard for him. He was a good tactician, a good hard worker, but he was more conservative than Spellman.

Berentson wanted to placate the Republican leadership in the House, he was all the time trying to position Spellman so that the Republican leadership in the House would be pleased with what Spellman was doing. Of course, the Republican leadership in the House was in a minority and was not really reflective of the mainstream of political thought in this state. That caused Spellman even further problems. He had trouble playing hardball with the Legislature. A lot of legislators didn't take him seriously on some of the things he said because of the evidence that this was going to be his position, and then it changed. They felt he was indecisive. It took him forever to make up his mind. As far as Spellman was concerned, many people felt this. I didn't so much because I didn't know it that much. Many people felt that the strong person was Mrs. Spellman, not John, that his wife in many respect had more political sense about something, and more of a commitment to things than he did.

He was a very friendly guy, and he wanted people to like him. I never did figure out who the hell he got his advice from in the final analysis, and how he made up his final decision about how he was going to do something. Usually you could figure that out about a governor, which three, four or five people were the governor's close advisors. But I was never sure in the case of the Spellman.

Another problem of his administration…here's where John Gese comes into the act. I was still chairman of the State Council on Aging. Spellman reappointed me—I was appointed by three different governors, and two different political parties. We would work on a matter. One time during the Spellman administration I had a deal where I had the whole State Council on Aging meet in the governor's board room. I had this programmed with Gese in advance as to what the issues were, and that Spellman was to come in at a certain time, and he was to speak on these issues very knowledgeably. It made him look good, and it would please the Council on Aging that the governor was interested in these things. When all the homework had been done—you talk about some of them being planned—that was planned. Finally the governor came in late. I had to personally go in there to remind somebody he was supposed to come in. He came in, but he didn't have any idea about these issues. He sits there and says, "Well, do you have any questions you want to ask me?" Something like that.

John Gese was sitting there and just about slunk out of his chair and onto the floor. We rescued the thing as best we could. I saw John Gese the next day, and I said, "Now, what in the hell happened?"

He said, "You know, I can't deny this thing was a mess. Norm, I did everything that you and I agreed on. I wrote all the stuff out. He never ever got to see it."

Richard Allison was in the act at the time. He said, "This whole thing is screwed up in this office as far as the governor being briefed, and knowing what the situation is before he goes into a meeting like that. I'm just sorry this whole thing occurred."

I said, "Well, I don't think any irreparable damage was done. But it sure caught me off-guard. I thought this thing was all programmed."

Mr. Scott: Spellman claimed that he was a superior administrator.

Mr. Schut: Yes. That was his campaign.

Mr. Scott: On paper, when one looks at the structure of the administration in the Archives, it appears highly structured. You're suggesting that the flow was something else?

Mr. Schut: Something went wrong. There was a period of time when I wondered whether he even wanted to be governor. One of the problems he was running into were some things that he had expected before seeing.

Later on, that fellow, Steve Excell, told me, "Well, the governor's getting interested in foreign trade now, in the Pacific." Steve said, "You know, he's now suddenly getting interested in being governor, and is going to run for re-election. He is interested in foreign trade. He's taken a couple trips to the Far East, and he sees what the governor can do in promoting the economy of the state. So now he's taking it seriously."

But Spellman went through a period there, where he honestly was discouraged about the whole thing. Now, in fairness to him, due to the economic decline, he had to cut the budgets that had been previously adopted. He had to call special sessions to raise some new taxes to get us over the hump. He didn't have a pleasant time. The money was coming in under Dixy Lee Ray. That's why we were able to do a lot of things like the senior citizen programs. And then to start going the other direction under Spellman…

When the Legislature met, they had the whole picture in front of them. They adopted a budget that was conservative and reasonable. Six months into the administration, the budget was out of kilter because the revenue thing went sour. So then the Legislature met again, and took up another deal. So it wasn't a pleasant time to be governor, George. I think it discouraged him. He went through a period there where he wondered, "Why did I ever get into this?"

Mr. Scott: Did John Spellman have his own agenda, or was it developed by others after he arrived?

Mr. Schut: I can't say. I know that I went to one meeting after the election was over, and I was shocked at it. There was Joe Taller, director of OFM. He was making a presentation to this bunch of business people at the Rainier Club. I had been invited. He was saying, "We're going to come up with a budget that will stay within the present tax revenues. There's never going to be any tax increases under the Spellman administration. We're going to keep things going the way they are. We'll even be able to do some new programs by more efficient methods."

Spellman was sitting there nodding and nodding, and I was scowling. After the meeting was over John Spellman came up to me, and he said, "What are you scowling for?"

I said, "That's a bunch of bullshit. Anybody who knows anything about state government knows that you've got trouble ahead. You can't do these things you've just talked about. You're going to have to make some tax increases, and you're going to have to make some cuts."

"That's not what they're telling me," Spellman said.

I said, "By god, you're going to find out. I'm just telling you, you're asking for trouble if you go making these flat statements as Joe just made, and you sit there nodding in agreement."

I remember Bill Boeing Jr. was sitting there thinking it was great. So I think he went in there with one set of expectations. And then the thing turned out to be entirely different. It wasn't a fun thing. It wasn't a fun

thing at all.

The people within the administration had the kind of feeling that he was sort of indecisive. The Legislature knew that they could deal with Duane Berentson. They weren't really dealing with Spellman, but they were dealing with Duane Berentson.

They also knew because of the fact that Spellman said, "I'm drawing the line." That was his favorite expression. "I'm not going to go back beyond this point." And then he kept drawing the line, moving the line further back. He didn't turn people on. He wasn't a kind of a guy that really got you turned on.

Now, he appointed this Tax Advisory Council. He called me in and said, "I want you very much to serve on that Tax Advisory Council. I know from the Evans administration you were a supporter of tax reform, and the tax revenue department people tell me you're knowledgeable about state government. I need somebody from organized labor, and from the Third Congressional District. The Legislature itself has set up some parameters for appointments on that. I'd like you to serve on that."

I said, "If you're serious about it. If this is just a game you're playing or something you've got to go through, I've got a hell of a lot of other things on my mind to do. My mind isn't as good as it used to be…"

"I'm absolutely serious about this," Spellman said.

He wasn't. He was afraid of it. And the more that thing developed… Former Representative Ned Shera, conservative Republican from Tacoma, came on board. He was the guy who convinced me that we ought to again go for an income tax.

I was telling the committee, "I've been through that route twice." The first time I went through it with Evans. We got defeated two to one. An honest look-see was made as to what we did wrong. We then came up with a proposal to correct it; we had all of these political problems. We then got it on the ballot, and I fought the battle within the State Labor Council to at least get them neutral, if not to support it. Some of the unions did support it. We then went to the people and it got defeated almost three to one.

Mr. Scott: Were the unions split, members split on it because they didn't feel the tax was adequate, or because they were really opposed to an income tax?

Mr. Schut: I went to that convention in the Tri-Cities area, the second time around on the tax reform. I thought I was attending a convention of the Republican Party in 1928. I listened to the electricians, the plumbers…

Mr. Scott: The trades, the craftsmen.

Mr. Schut: The higher-income level working people who had moved to the suburbs. And by god, they were paying too many taxes now. They didn't want any income tax taken out of their pay check. They wanted

their hands on it first. The leadership was for tax reform and an income tax. The national organization was on record. But it's just like open housing and some of those issues. The leadership may take a position, but the rank and file feel differently about it.

When Spellman finally saw how that committee was coming out…I think there were only three votes against the proposal. One of them was the conservative Republican floor leader from Tri-Cities area that was in the janitorial supply business. He was opposed to it. The guy from the Grange was negative because he had run into trouble in his own convention where they had originally supported an income tax. They were now having a lot of argument within the Grange over it. I can't remember who the third one was.

Boeing representatives supported it, and a lot of others who were there did also. But Spellman was afraid of it. He was afraid of it politically. He hemmed and hawed. He never ever came right out and told the chairman of that committee that he had any misgivings about it. We were led to believe that he was going to come out four-square and support the proposal. When it came to a proposal before the Legislature, and I was one of those that testified in the hearing in the House for it, he waffled all over the place.

Mr. Scott: Did he testify before the Legislature?

Mr. Schut: No, but he waffled all over the place. It became apparent to us early on that Spellman was scared of the issue. He had attacked Jim McDermott on wanting the tax increase and being for an income tax, so he was politically afraid of it. I always wondered when the chips were down and there was a really controversial issue that took courage and guts, whether this man had it.

Mr. Scott: Complaints have been made about the governor's apparent indecisiveness. Who then was in charge? What role, for instance, did Dick Allison, Spellman's chief of staff, play?

Mr. Schut: He was there in the early part. He was from New York State or New England, and he didn't know much about Washington State or Washington State government. That was a problem. He was very meticulous and structured as far as how the office worked. I could never quite figure him out. Jim Waldo and Steve Excell were the two that came into the picture much more. And then Allison left, and they began to take hold. They probably had as much influence on Spellman as anybody did.

Spellman was a compartmentalized man. Duane Berentson and Spellman, that was a legislative show. Steve Excell with certain facets of the administration, and Spellman, that was that part of it. Somebody else was some other part of it. Directors told me he felt that their motivation was to just to do a job and stay out of trouble. They didn't feel they even had to be in contact with him very much. What I'm trying to say is that there wasn't any feeling that he was consulting with them. You know, Dixy Lee Ray would set up a task force,

and maybe make Robert Hollister chairman of a committee of some cabinet members, and they would study a certain issue, and bring her in a report. That didn't happen under Spellman. His directors, from those that talked honestly with me, said they were kind of going on the basis of, "I'm here to do my job, keep him out of trouble, and don't rock the boat." They didn't have much contact with the guy. He was kind of chairman of the board, but not really involved with what they were doing.

Mr. Scott: Jim Waldo was an advisor, but was never a part of the administration per se?

Mr. Schut: He was never on the payroll, no. He was very much in his campaign the first time around and the second time around as well.

Mr. Scott: Why was Glen Pascall fired?

Mr. Schut: The only thing I ever knew was that I overheard people within the governor's staff saying they were getting a little sick and tired of this guy taking flat, positive positions on his own, without knowing how exactly Spellman felt. Pascall's defense on that was yes, he did have talks with Spellman. Spellman had never thrown any cold water on what he was saying, nor had he discouraged him.

END OF INTERVIEW